Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 8-15, 18, 19, and 22-28; canceled claims 2-3, 6-7, 16-17, 20-21, and 29-31; and added claims 32-38. After the above amendments have been entered, claims 1, 4, 5, 8-15, 18-19, 22-28, and 32-38 will be pending. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 8, 10-12, 15, 22, 24-26, 30, 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alonso et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,092,936). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 15

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising:

receiving a search query;

identifying a plurality of item identifiers responsive to the search query, wherein each item identifier is associated with an item offered for sale and comprises information regarding the item;

selecting a first group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers, wherein the first group of item identifiers was received *from a vendor feed*, the vendor feed comprising information from at least one vendor offering one or more items for sale;

selecting a second group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers, wherein the second group of item identifiers was obtained by extraction of item identifiers from shopping documents offering one or more items for sale, the shopping documents *not received directly from a vendor feed*; and

displaying at least one item identifier from the first group in a visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group.

Alonso fails to disclose the elements "selecting a first group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers, wherein the first group of item identifiers was received *from a vendor feed*, the vendor feed comprising information from at least one vendor offering one or more items for sale" and "selecting a second group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers, wherein the second group of item identifiers was obtained by extraction of item identifiers from shopping documents offering one or more items for sale, the shopping documents *not received directly from a vendor feed*."

Alonso generally discusses a system and method for search and recommendation based on usage mining. (Abstract) It mentions retrieval of recommendations relating to a search query string based on search query logs and user profile data, query expansion and text searching based on an expanded query, and thematic clustering of the search results. (Detailed Description). As the Examiner recognized on page 7 of the pending Action, Alonso does not teach receiving the first group of identifiers through a **vendor feed** or obtaining the second group of identifiers through **extraction of item identifiers from shopping documents.**

Tomita also fails to teach the elements at issue. Tomita generally discusses a way to allow a user to buy goods from stores near the user without directly purchasing the goods on a computer network. Tomita discusses a memory device which stores information concerning goods (e.g. including which stores carry the goods) in a commodity file (Fig. 4) and information about stores handling the class of goods (e.g. addresses of stores) in a store file (Fig. 5). However, both types of information come from the same source, the "sales assistance server." (para. 41, 43-45) Thus, the claim elements reciting a first group of identifiers "**received from a vendor feed**" and a second group of item identifiers "obtained

by extraction of item identifiers from shopping documents offering one or more items for sale, the shopping documents **not received directly from a vendor feed**" are not shown.

The Examiner relied on Figure 13 and paragraph 44 of Tomita as disclosing receiving item identifiers through a vendor feed. In fact, Figure 13 merely shows a "list of recommendable commodities", created from the commodity file (para. 53). The user can select a recommended commodity via the interface shown in Figure 13. Indeed, paragraph 44 states that the information in the store file is "inputted at the side of the above-mentioned sales assistance server" in "the same manner as the above mentioned commodity file." Thus, rather than showing receiving item identifiers from a vendor feed for the store file and extraction from shopping documents not received directly from a vendor feed for the commodity file, this paragraph shows that all of the information in the store and commodity files comes from the same source.

Independent claim 15 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 11 and 25

Claim 11 has been amended to recite a method comprising:

receiving a search query;

identifying a plurality of item identifiers responsive to the search query, wherein each *item identifier is associated with an item offered for sale* and comprises information regarding the item;

selecting a first group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers;

determining a first degree of certainty that each item identifier from the first group of item identifiers has been *correctly associated* with a respective item;

selecting a second group of item identifiers from the plurality of item identifiers;

determining a second degree of certainty that each item identifier from the second group of item identifiers has been *correctly associated* with a respective item; and

displaying a representation of the first degree of certainty, a representation of the second degree of certainty, and at least one item identifier from the first group in a visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group.

Alonso fails to recite these elements. Alonso does not discuss "identifying a plurality of item identifiers...wherein each *item identifier is associated with an item offered for sale* and comprises information regarding the item", any determination of a first or second degree of certainty that item identifiers have been *correctly associated* with a respective item, or displaying a representation of any such certainty determination. The first passage cited by the Examiner (col. 2, lines 1-19) generally discusses using user search query logs, patters and profile information to create recommendations. It does not disclose that each item identifier is associated with an item offered for sale or any degree of certainty that the item identifiers have been correctly associated with an item. The second passage cited by the Examiner (col. 1, lines 55-60) generally discusses using an expanded query to retrieve documents, and generating themes relating to the retrieved document. Again, the elements described above are not mentioned. In addition, Alonso makes no mention of "displaying a representation of the first degree of certainty, a representation of the second degree of certainty, and at least one item identifier from the first group in a visually distinct way from at least one item identifier from the second group."

Tomita does not remedy the deficiencies of Alonso. Tomita does not discuss any determination of a first or second degree of certainty that item identifiers have been *correctly associated* with a respective item, or displaying a representation of any such certainty determination. These elements are not mentioned.

Independent claim 25 is patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 11.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-7, 9, 13, 14, 16-21, 23, and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alonso in view of Tomita. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Alonso and Tomita, alone or in combination, fail to recite the elements of the claims at least for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4, 5, 8-10, and 32-35 recite additional limitations and depend directly or indirectly from claim 1; claims 12-14, and 36-38 recite additional limitations and depend directly or indirectly from claim 11; claims 18, 19, and 22-24 recite additional limitations and depend directly or indirectly from claim 15; claims 26-28 recite additional limitations and depend directly or indirectly from claim 25.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the applied art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
CRAIG NEVILL-MANNING, ET AL.

Date: December 19, 2007   By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198

Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com